

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 9, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 are now pending in the application. The amendments to the claims contained herein are not intended to broaden the scope thereof. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Turning first to the non-consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed September 26, 2007, Applicant respectfully points out that the EPO Office Action submitted was the Second Office Action issued by the European Patent Office, and no additional references were cited in that Office Action. Applicant submitted the Search Report for the Examiner's information only.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by Bella (6, 181, 775). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a system for testing subscriber lines, comprising a broadband line testing control module and a remote terminal subscriber access control module located at a subscriber line between the broadband line testing control module and a remote terminal unit, wherein said broadband line testing control module is configured to send a signal of disconnecting the subscriber line to the remote terminal subscriber access control module through a terminal managing channel of a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer (DSLAM), and test the subscriber line; and (emphasis added)

said remote terminal subscriber access control module is configured to receive said signal from the broadband line testing control module, and control the remote terminal unit to

disconnect from the subscriber line based on said signal.

In claim 1, the signal of disconnecting the subscriber line is sent to the remote terminal subscriber access control module through a terminal managing channel of a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexer (DSLAM), and the subscriber line is tested after the remote terminal unit is disconnected from the subscriber line based on said signal. Therefore, the subscriber line can be tested without being affected by the remote terminal unit.

Comparatively, Bella recites that a first test phase in which a test signal is sent back to the central office is performed upon the reception of a voltage reversal condition lasting two seconds, and the central office checks the twisted pair between the central office and the customer's premises, and a second test phase which is performed after the first test phase and in which the customer-end ADSL low pass filter is bypassed so that the central office can test the customer's POTS equipment. (See the abstract and col. 8 lines 10-37 of Bella)

Accordingly, Bella does not teach or suggest that the signal of disconnecting the subscriber line is sent through the terminal managing channel of the DSLAM. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Bella and respectfully requests allowance of amended claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-6 depend on independent claim 1 and incorporate all limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons established above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6 are not anticipated by Bella.

Since claim 7 recites features analogous to independent claim 1, applicant submits that claim 7 is also patentable for reasons analogous to those presented above. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7.

Dependent claims 10-11 depend on claim 7 and incorporate all limitations of claim 7.

Accordingly, for the reasons established above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-11 are not anticipated by Bella.

The examiner further rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella in view of Ginesi et al (2003/0063711). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Dependent claims 8-9 depend on claim 7 and incorporate all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, for the reasons established above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-9 are not obvious in light of the suggested combination and respectfully requests allowance of these claims.

For at least the above noted reasons, Bella and Ginesi et al. taken alone or together do not show all limitations of claims 8-9, and thus do not support a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of these claims. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection of claims 8-9.

In view of the above reasons, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed to be in order, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the application; the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1696.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to our Docket No. 56815.1800.

Respectfully submitted,



Leo J. Jennings
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: April 9, 2008
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 861-1500
Fax: (202) 861-1783